UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2554th MEETING: 31 AUGUST 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2554)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East: Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2554th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 31 August 1984, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Léandre BASSOLE (Burkina Faso).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2554)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The Situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)

1. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2552nd and 2553rd meetings*], I invite the representative of Lebanon and the representative of Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Kuwait, Qatar, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) and Mr. Blum (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Al-Mosfir (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. Noman (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Damavandi Kamali (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* The first speaker is the representative of Qatar. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: I wish to thank the members of the Council for allowing me to participate in the debate on a question that is of general concern to all peace-loving States whose policies are based on justice—in particular to my country and to other Arab countries, because this question is linked to the rights of a fraternal Arab country, Lebanon. Lebanon has been suffering since 1982 from the repercussions of Israel's brutal invasion and belligerent occupation of a large part of its national soil, in complete disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the rules of international law, which prohibit the use of force against the territorial integrity and national independence of any State.

5. The United Nations should seek to bring about the termination of the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the full and immediate withdrawal of the invading Israeli forces from the occupied territories. An end must be put to the aggression perpetrated against a Member State; the provisions of the Charter and of international law must be applied to those who have departed from international law and flouted the principles of the Charter.

6. Therefore, the discussion of the practices of the Israeli occupation forces in southern Lebanon goes beyond those practices. Even if Israel were to put an end to those practices, the Israeli occupation itself would still stand rejected by the international community. Indeed, the core of the issue is the continued aggressive Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon. Hence, the only acceptable solution is to put an end

to that occupation and to bring about respect for the sovereignty of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. That course has been clearly and unequivocally established by the Council in paragraph 1 of resolution 509 (1982) in which the Council "demands that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon."

7. Consistent with its usual practice, Israel has disregarded that resolution and has ridden roughshod over it. Therefore, the primary duty of the Council now is to reaffirm that resolution and to compel Israel to implement it without delay.

8. The Council has listened to the statement made by my brother, the representative of Lebanon [*2552nd meeting*], containing the details of the illegal Israeli practices which weigh heavily on the civilians living in southern Lebanon. To mention just a few, he cited the following: the breaking into houses; detention and torture of innocent people; the seizing of villages and the cutting off of supplies; desecration of places of worship; harassment of religious leaders; the prevention of Lebanese officials from carrying out their duties; the taking of hostages, the burning of orchards; limitation of the freedom of transportation, to the extent of cutting off the south of Lebanon from the rest of the country in an attempt to cause the people to leave. Israel has thus paved the way towards fulfilling its expansionist plans and has already embarked on a plan for the seizure by force of the water resources of the region.

9. There is no doubt that all those practices constitute a breach of the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1] That Convention and its provisions set forth the minimum required of the occupying authorities during military operations, which means in time of war.

10. Nobody can claim that a formal state of war exists in Lebanon: military operations have ceased. What we see now is an aggressive occupation resulting from a previous illegal state of war. It follows that, in the absence of war, a higher level of compliance with the law should be expected of those military forces.

11. The Israeli occupation forces are called upon, at least, to respect the principles of international law which prohibit the harassment of civilians, so that the occupation itself will not serve as a pretext to violate the rights of the citizens and to impair their living conditions. This means that the life of the civilians could continue as if there were no occupation.

12. Does the Israeli conduct in southern Lebanon fulfil that criterion? Of course not. The occupation forces have embarked on cutting off southern Lebanon from the rest of the country, making its isolation almost complete. There is no freedom of transportation; there is no possibility of trade with the rest of the country; there is no security and no safety for the civilians, who are constantly subject to detention and inspection, and deprived of legal protection.

13. No doubt, we will continue to hear the same flimsy excuse: that those measures and practices are necessary for the protection of the safety and security of the occupying forces. That is a travesty of logic and it is totally unacceptable: the right to safety and security is an element of the right of presence. If one is in illegal possession of property, he cannot claim that his safety and security are threatened by the victim of his crime.

14. The Israeli occupying forces have put themselves in a situation where they are subjected to predictable and natural reactions from a people whose territories have been violated and whose national sovereignty has been undermined. They have no right to invoke that as a pretext to oppress the civilians, to deny their human rights and to destroy their lives.

15. The first link in this endless chain of violence was the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the violation of its territorial integrity. That chain will have no end unless the forces of occupation withdraw, forthwith and unconditionally, from all the Lebanese territories.

16. My delegation calls upon the Council to adopt a resolution affirming the first part of its resolution 509 (1982), and to call once more upon Israel to withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon.

17. The Council should affirm both resolutions 512 (1982) and 513 (1982) concerning respect for the rights of civilian populations and put an end to the acts of violence against them. The Council must compel Israel to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other relevant international conventions; it must also reaffirm Lebanon's historic water rights and countenance none of the flimsy attempts to violate them.

18. My delegation is confident that the Council will live up to its responsibility and respond favourably to Lebanon's legitimate complaint.

19. Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) [*interpretation from Russian*]: The tense situation in Lebanon, occupied by the Israeli military clique, and in other seized Arab lands, has caused serious alarm and concern throughout the whole world and, of course, in the United Nations, too. The recent appeal by the Government of Lebanon to the Council, and the statement made in this chamber by its representative, once again reaffirm the escalation of the criminal policy pursued by the Israeli aggressors in southern Lebanon.

20. Having undertaken a large-scale invasion of Lebanon more than two years ago, Israel, flouting the resolutions of the Council, continues to occupy about a

third of the territory of that country. The history of this Israeli military adventure, which is part of a general policy of aggression—territorial, political and economic expansion against the Arab peoples—pursued by Tel Aviv, with the protection and support of Washington, has been written in the blood of the defenceless Lebanese and Palestinians.

21. Starting in June 1982, in the southern part of Lebanon, Israel established a régime of ruthless terror and violence against the local people. All norms of international humanitarian law have been trampled under foot and human rights are being grossly and massively violated.

22. Each day brings news of fresh instances of wanton acts by the Israeli military clique. The incarceration of hundreds of people, including women and old people, in concentration camps, outrageous acts of torture, the taking of hostages, massive raids and arrests have become the daily practices of the occupiers.

23. Repression of the local people and acts of terror against them are accompanied by economic aggression against southern Lebanon and the Israeli authorities' illegal and predatory domination of the occupied territory. Serious damage has been done to agriculture, and the covetous gaze of Israeli expansionists has turned to Lebanon's water resources.

24. Having recently undertaken measures further to exacerbate the occupation régime in southern Lebanon, the Israeli occupiers are obviously seeking to fragment Lebanon, to isolate the seized regions from the rest of the country and to entrench themselves there.

25. From the very beginning of this recent military adventure, the Israeli leaders said that their goal was to guarantee the "security" of the northern borders of Israel, and for this they needed to "establish some order" in the 45-kilometre zone on the Lebanese border. This alone makes it quite clear what Tel Aviv's attitude is to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Arab countries, to international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

26. The Israeli leaders have not hidden the fact that the invasion of Lebanon was an action planned ahead of time. Typically, even the former Israeli Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Eban, recognized, according to *The New York Times* of 4 June 1984, that "it cost more human lives than terrorists in the whole world over a period of decades could have caused".

27. At the very beginning of Israel's aggression, the international community decisively condemned Tel Aviv's criminal act. Security Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) called on Israel to cease immediately all military activities and to withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized borders of Lebanon. However, those resolutions, like many others, have not yet been implemented and are being brazenly disregarded by Tel Aviv. Furthermore, recently Israel committed another crime against Lebanon by bombing Mejdel Anjar. The result was further destruction and further civilian casualties. As has been stressed so many times in the Council and the General Assembly, Israel has been openly and grossly flouting the obligations it assumed when it became a Member of the United Nations; and yet Israel is the only country which acquired statehood as the result of a United Nations decision.

28. It is quite clear that Israel could not behave in such a defiant and brazen manner in Lebanon and other occupied Arab territories were it not for the patronage and all-round support given it by its strategic ally from across the ocean. In fact, the United States has not concealed its concern that Lebanon should be bled white, weakened and turned into a United States–Israeli protectorate.

29. As has been noted in the Council, by arming and protecting the aggressor, the United States, together with Israel, bears direct responsibility for the dangerous situation that has evolved not only in Lebanon but in the whole of the Middle East, a situation which is a threat to international peace. Furthermore, in an attempt to expand its military presence in this region by any means, the United States has been following an openly hostile policy towards the Arab peoples and has been encouraging the aggressor to commit further expansionist acts. As recently as a few days ago, the President of the United States again reaffirmed the pro-Israeli stance of the United States Middle East policy and said: "We shall always maintain our pledge never to sell out one of our closest friends, the State of Israel."* As they say, "no comment".

30. The continuing Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the gross interference by Israel and the United States in the affairs of that long-suffering country are the fundamental causes for the crisis situation in and around Lebanon. The Ukrainian SSR believes that it is the true duty of the Council to call for the unconditional withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel from Lebanon, on the basis of resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982), in order to ensure respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon and an end forthwith to the arbitrary rule and acts of violence of the occupying Israeli forces in Lebanon.

31. The grim experience of recent decades has shown that neither military adventures nor separate deals have brought—or can bring—peace to the peoples of the Middle East. Peace can only be secured as a result of international efforts on a collective basis with the participation of all parties concerned. It is precisely that approach to the solution of the Middle East problem that is advocated by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

32. A recent example of this constructive approach was the proposals of the Soviet Union on a Middle East settlement, dated 29 July 1984 [*see S/16685, annex*].

33. The situation in the Middle East must be decisively channelled towards finding a comprehensive just settlement guaranteeing the restitution of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and the right to peace and security of all States and peoples of the region.

34. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

35. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: On behalf of the delegation of the United Arab Emirates, I am pleased to convey to you, Sir, our warm congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your well-known skills and ability in the various posts you have held previously, as well as your objectivity demonstrated during your presidency of the Council, are a source of pride for you personally, the country you represent, the African continent to which you belong and the third world as a whole.

36. I should also like to convey our thanks and appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of the United States, for the able manner in which she conducted the business of the Council during the past month.

37. Under your presidency this month, Sir, the Council has been convened twice. The first time it was to deal with an African issue: the injustice and suffering inflicted upon the peoples of southern Africa by the Fascist Pretoria régime, which emanated from the European continent and occupied part of the African continent, plundering its natural resources and persecuting and deporting its indigenous population. And now the Council is meeting again to take up a matter similar to that considered by the Council in the first half of this month. But this time it is not the situation in southern Africa but in the Middle East—in Lebanon. Lebanon has had recourse to the Council as a small country pinning all its hopes on this body to help it rid itself of the injustice of the Zionist-Israeli occupation and the plundering of its people and natural resources.

38. Lebanon has come to the Council to complain against the oppression and the usurpation of the water rights to which this Arab people is being subjected, particularly in the south, which is being occupied by the settler Fascist force called the State of Israel.

39. As we are all aware, the overwhelming majority of the members of the Council have at one time or another suffered from occupation and its injustice. For example, the American people suffered from the injustice inflicted by occupation; the French people's pride was stung by the German occupation of their capital; and the Soviet people as well suffered from occupation.

40. The non-permanent members of the Council are all aware of the severe injustice—the theft and the plunder of the resources and wealth of peoples—inflicted by occupation. In the light of that injustice from which they themselves have all suffered in the past, Arab Lebanon has come here to appeal for help to remove the injustice inflicted upon it, to rid its territory of the Israeli occupation forces and to achieve the implementation of Council resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

41. International law, in particular the humanitarian aspects of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] seeks the protection of civilian populations in areas under military occupation by any State in the following three categories: the populations themselves, their resources and their institutions. Those are the three humanitarian aspects that should be fully protected under international law.

42. With regard to persons, international law provides the necessary guarantees for protecting the life, health, freedom and wealth of civilian populations; it also forbids subjecting them to persecution, discrimination, torture, imprisonment or detention. In his statement before the Council, the Lebanese representative gave a long list of crimes perpetrated by Israel against the civilian population in occupied southern Lebanon. Those crimes include detention, imprisonment, torture, exile, deportation and even murder directly or by proxy—all of which runs counter to and is in contravention of several provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention.

43. With regard to resources, international law guarantees the protection of resources and financial institutions; also, occupation forces are not entitled to plunder that wealth or harass investment institutions. In his statement before the Council, the representative of Lebanon pointed out the following acts committed by the Israeli occupation authorities: destruction of agricultural fields, setting fire to harvests, uprooting citrus trees, destroying fences around orchards, confiscating buildings, stealing water, hampering the production sectors and plundering the cultural monuments of his country—all of which runs counter to and is in contravention of several provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention.

44. With regard to institutions, international law stipulates the necessity of protecting education, government, constitutional and religious institutions, as well as the continued carrying out of their mission; of course, occupation forces are not entitled to alter any of these institutions. In his statement before the Council, the representative of Lebanon told of the actions taken by the Israeli occupation authorities; including the seizure of Lebanese government buildings, confiscation

of archives, expulsion of officials and preventing governors from contacting official authorities in Beirut. He also pointed out that special permission must be obtained to gain access to and from occupied territories, that villagers needed to obtain Israeli identification cards and that students were being prevented from taking examinations. Israel has gone further and interfered with religious practices, not respecting the inviolability of mosques. Again, all that runs counter to and is in contravention of several of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention.

45. From what I have said, it can be seen that Israel has violated the letter and the spirit of the provisions of that Convention, which embodies the international community's concern to protect civilian populations from the scourge and injustice that can be inflicted by occupation forces, following upon the bitter experiences of civilians during the Second World War.

46. Arab Lebanon has been a State Party to that Convention since 10 April 1951. The so-called State of Israel is also a Party, having ratified it on 6 July 1961. Israel's obligation to implement that Convention fully is based on article 2 of the Convention, which stipulates that the Convention applies in all cases of declared war or of any armed conflict between two contracting parties; and that it also applies to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a contracting State.

47. Israel's obligation fully to respect the Convention is based on its article 1, which stipulates that the Contracting States undertake to respect and ensure respect for the Convention in all circumstances.

48. It is crystal clear that Israel—exactly as in the case of South Africa—does not implement the Convention in occupied southern Lebanon. Israel has violated its undertaking to respect it by invading Lebanon and occupying its territory. Faced with that situation, the States members of the Council in their capacity as Parties to that Convention must, in accordance with article 1, take all necessary measures to compel Israel to respect the Convention. The responsibility of members of the Council stems from the Charter of the United Nations, which has entrusted this body with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is clear that the continued Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the persistence of the inhuman practices and violations by the Israeli authorities are threatening international peace and security.

49. The crux of the problem in southern Lebanon is Israel's act of aggression against Lebanon and its occupation of part of Lebanon's territory, as well as its refusal to withdraw its occupying forces.

50. This act of aggression constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter and the rules of international law. It is also a violation of article 1 (2) of the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement concluded on 23 March 1949,[2] which stipulates the following:

> "No aggressive action by the armed forces—land, sea or air—of either Party shall be undertaken, planned, or threatened against the people or the armed forces of the other."*

Paragraph 1 of that article prohibits Israel from carrying out acts of aggression against Lebanon. Israel falsely claims that it has attacked Lebanon to eradicate the Palestinians living there, and in particular the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) which would enable Israel to impose a settlement of the question of Palestine. The paragraph stipulates:

> "The injunction of the Security Council against resort to military force in the settlement of the Palestine question shall henceforth be scrupulously respected by both Parties."*

51. The Council adopted resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) on the question; in the latter, it categorically and unequivocally affirmed the necessity of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon—the boundaries between Lebanon and occupied Palestine.

52. More than two years have elapsed since the adoption of those two resolutions, and Israel has not yet withdrawn. On the contrary, it is consolidating its occupation and presence in southern Lebanon.

53. Faced with such a situation, the Council, if it is to protect its dignity and prestige, has no choice but to make sure those two resolutions are implemented, and thus to force the so-called State of Israel to withdraw. We say this because, like all others, we are aware that Israel will continue its practices and its violations of the rights of the civilian population in occupied southern Lebanon and even escalate them as long as the occupation continues.

54. A case in point is what has been happening on the West Bank of occupied Palestine and in the Israeli-occupied Gaza Strip and Golan Heights.

55. At the outset I said that the Council was meeting to consider yet another aspect of Israel's aggressive policy, its racist, Fascist practices and its violations of the Charter and other international norms. If the Council deals with this complaint as it has dealt with other similar aspects of Israeli policy, I am afraid that this will not be its last meeting on the subject and that the vicious circle will remain unbroken.

56. Israel's policies, in their totality and in their particulars, give rise to three basic requirements: first, settlement of the question of Palestine in a manner that would enable the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable right to return to its homeland, Palestine, and the right to self-determination and establishment of an

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

independent Palestinian State on the Palestinian soil now occupied; secondly, the ending of Israeli aggression and expansion; thirdly, implementation by all members of the Council of its resolutions pertaining to the question of Palestine and the Middle East as a whole. If the Council fails to deal with those three requirements in an integrated manner, Lebanon will time and again have to come to the Council to complain against Israel. Other Arab States will undoubtedly have to lodge similar complaints—different, perhaps, in form and detail but all having the same essence and origin: Israeli aggression and expansion and the denial of legitimate Palestinian rights.

57. Finally, we sincerely hope that the Council will pursue a new course commensurate with the magnitude of the problem, a just course based on the Council's great responsibility under the Charter.

58. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

59. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Mr. President, at the outset I should like to thank you and the other members for allowing me to participate in the discussion of the question before the Council. I should like personally and on behalf of my country to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We are confident that your well-known wisdom, expertise and knowledge will help the Council fulfil its role in the best manner possible.

60. It is also our pleasure to express appreciation to the representative of the United States for the able manner in which she conducted the work of the Council last month.

61. At the outset of the Council's deliberations, Wednesday afternoon, the representative of Lebanon said that his Government had come before the Council on behalf of its people—in particular those in the south—who for many years had suffered Israeli attacks and aggression and, since June 1982, the continued Israeli occupation of large parts of their land, as well as repressive practices aimed at depopulating those areas, plundering the natural resources, cutting them off from the rest of Lebanon and ultimately annexing them. This is consistent with the Israeli expansionist policies which have characterized Israel since its establishment. He also mentioned that his Government had resorted to the Council on behalf of the whole world, which has adopted legal instruments and codes governing international relations and the peaceful conduct of States—norms prohibiting aggression, occupation and the use of force.

62. My delegation can find no better, more eloquent evidence than that adduced by the representative of Lebanon in presenting his country's case before the Council. This question contains two elements: the first is national: Israel's continued occupation of Lebanese territories and the repressive practices of the Israeli occupation forces against the peaceable inhabitants of southern Lebanon; the second is international: the world's indifference to the continued occupation of territories of a Member State, in clear violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, not to mention the world's silence over the inhuman practices against civilian inhabitants and the plundering of resources in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] and of The Hague Conventions II of 1899 and IV of 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land.[1]

63. I need not, I think, remind the Council—mandated to maintain international peace and security—or the international community of the danger inherent in Israel's conduct, not only as regards the situation in southern Lebanon but as a serious precedent in a world replete with other examples of occupation, the use of force, the torturing of civilians and all manner of violations of international law. Therefore Lebanon's resort to the Council concerns not only Lebanon but all members of the international community, which must, along with the Council, protect Lebanon and other victims of aggression and occupation and assist them in recovering their land and punishing the aggressor in accordance with the Charter.

64. The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, governed by the principles and tenets of its foreign policy, denounces the use of force in international relations, condemns occupation and interference in the internal affairs of other States and reaffirms its condemnation of the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa Valley and the Rashaya district. Furthermore, it calls for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli occupation forces from all Lebanese territories to enable fraternal Lebanon to regain independence and national sovereignty and to embark on the task of internal reconstruction.

65. We also appeal for assistance to the Government of National Unity in its efforts to achieve peace and unity in Lebanon.

66. On 6 June 1982, immediately after the ruthless Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982), demanding, in paragraph 1, that Israel withdraw all its military forces forthwith and unconditionally to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. That resolution reaffirmed the need for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries.

67. Resolution 509 (1982) follows numerous resolutions adopted by the Council in the face of Israeli harassment and attacks on Lebanon—to mention but a

few, resolutions 425 (1978) and 501 (1982), which were adopted after similar attacks on Lebanon. The records of the Security Council and of the General Assembly are replete with other resolutions on Israeli violations, aggression, occupation and practices in the occupied Palestinian territories and other occupied Arab territories. In most of those resolutions the Council has condemned and denounced Israel, calling for an end to its repeated violations and for respect for the Charter, the principles of international law and the resolutions of the Council.

68. What was Israel's response? More aggression and more blatant violations—despite the Council's resolutions and the international outrage triggered by Israel's scorn and by its defiance and violation of all internationally agreed principles and laws.

69. This time the Council is considering the Lebanese complaint concerning the outrageous Israeli practices in the occupied Lebanese territories. We believe that the Council's consideration of those practices is part and parcel of its quest for the speedy implementation of its previous resolutions on full and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory. We hope it will have an effect on whatever draft resolution the Council adopts on the subject.

70. As for Israel's practices in southern Lebanon, which are an extension of its practices in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Holy City of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, the representative of Lebanon has presented a detailed account of them and of Israel's violations of the rules of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 and of The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907. We do not believe that the Council and the international community need more details or more persuasion. Israel's record in southern Lebanon and in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories has been before the world for more than 30 years.

71. Israel's arbitrary practices in southern Lebanon against peaceful civilians and against property; its plans to isolate the south in order to engulf it; its activities aimed at plundering Lebanon's natural resources, its water in the first place, especially the waters of the Litani, Hasbani and Wazzani Rivers, which constitute the primary resource of the south and the principal source for irrigation and energy production: none of this is new. It has long been the custom for Israel to engage in these practices, as we have said.

72. There is no doubt that we cannot remain silent on this; nor can the Council. The would permit the continuation of the policy of *fait accompli* which forms the basis for Israel's gradual swallowing up of the occupied territories in Palestine and the Golan Heights, either through direct annexation or through the establishment of settlements populated by armed settlers and the intimidation of the inhabitants, causing them to flee their land and paving the way for final annexation to Israel.

73. Thus, Israel's aggression against southern Lebanon was motivated by nothing but Israel's fervent desire to expand, to occupy Arab territory, and to plunder the resources of that territory. Israel's northern borders were calm for a full year before its 1982 aggression against Lebanon. As a result of that aggression we are witnessing a general uprising by the population of southern Lebanon, despite the terrorism and oppression afflicting it. The Lebanese people are inflicting losses on the Israeli army of occupation which has imposed a state of siege in an attempt to defend itself.

74. We are confident that the people of Lebanon will persist in its legitimate struggle to liberate its land and achieve unity through that struggle and with the support of the Council.

75. In the light of what I have said, and because of our concern to re-establish and strengthen the Council's authority in the maintenance of international peace and security, and to compel Israel to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles of international law and of international conventions governing the conduct of States both in peace and in war, the Council is duty-bound to shoulder its obligations as set out in the Charter in order finally to put an end to Israel's stubbornness and aggression.

76. In that connection, my delegation fully and unequivocally supports the demands of Lebanon, as stated here by its representative when he called on the Council to effect the implementation of previous relevant resolutions regarding complete and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory to the internationally recognized border, to put an end to Israeli practices against the people of the occupied Lebanese territories, to force Israel immediately to lift its siege from the territories under occupation, and to reaffirm the established inalienable right of Lebanon to its own waters and other natural resources.

77. We are confident that the Council will meet these legitimate Lebanese demands, for if it fails to discharge its tasks not only will the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the suffering of the people of that area continue, but the aggressor and occupier will have been rewarded, the policy of aggression and the use of force in international relations will have been encouraged, and the international foundations and principles that have made the Council the guardian of international peace and security will have been undermined.

78. In conclusion, we should like to affirm that, in our view, just and lasting peace in the Middle East will be achieved only through a complete Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and through the establishment of an independent Palestinian State under the leadership of the PLO, the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people.

79. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic

Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

80. Mr. DAMAVANDI KAMALI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, the other members of the Council, for allowing us to participate in today's debate.

81. Once again the Council is debating the ongoing Israeli aggression against the Islamic nations of the Middle East, in this case against the south of Lebanon. This debate, like all others before it, has served one major purpose: to remind the international community of Israeli arrogance in blatantly violating the basic and inalienable rights of the peoples of the region, with the direct assistance and encouragement of the United States.

82. Everyone in this chamber—as well as every peace-loving human being in the world—is well aware of the aggressive nature of Israel and of its voracious appetite for expansion. The pattern that international zionism and its great supporter, the United States, have developed for the expansionist objectives of Israel has become a very familiar scenario, a scenario of occupation through the use of force and persistent harassment of the local population, to force them to abandon their homes and their lands and to take refuge elsewhere, thus paving the way for annexation.

83. The details of the behaviour of Israeli forces of occupation in southern Lebanon, presented to the Council by the representative of Lebanon, clearly demonstrate United States–Israeli objectives in the Middle East; no amount of misinformation by the American media can distort the truth.

84. The Council has so far been impotent *vis-à-vis* this conspiracy, because a crime of this magnitude extends far beyond the range of the Council's capabilities. When a permanent member of the Council, holding the power of veto, is a primary partner in a conspiracy, then the international community cannot expect the Council to be a defender of justice for the victims of that conspiracy.

85. Fortunately, the Council is not the only means available for the establishment of justice.

86. It is the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran that the victims of Zionist aggression should not fall into the trap set by the American-Zionist alliance and wait passively for the Council to gain their rights for them.

87. It gives us great satisfaction to see that the Muslim people of southern Lebanon are well aware of the various consequences of the ongoing Zionist aggression against them and are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices in order to abort that aggression. They have our support in their heroic struggle to regain their freedom and their dignity with the limited resources and capabilities that they actually have. They must be confident that the path they have chosen is the path of Allah and it is only this path that is going to lead them to victory, with his blessing.

88. Mr. LOUET (France) [*interpretation from French*]: The Council has met to consider the situation in the part of the Lebanese territory which is today occupied by Israeli armed forces. The deterioration noted there is of serious concern to my Government. The civilian population of that area has already suffered far too much and we cannot be indifferent to that suffering. In the circumstances, my delegation wishes to stress that Israel must respect the international conventions on humanitarian law applicable to armed conflicts. I am referring in particular to the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[1] Of course those texts give certain rights to the occupying Power, but that Power cannot rid itself of all—I repeat, all—the obligations imposed on it by the provisions of that Convention. How can we be sure of that inasmuch as the Israeli armed forces periodically challenge the mission which the Council has entrusted to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNFIL). I should like to remind members that the Council, in resolution 523 (1982), authorized:

> "the Force during that period to carry out . . . interim tasks in the humanitarian and administrative fields . . . and to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the security of all the inhabitants of the area without any discrimination".

89. We must note that UNFIL has had to deal on a number of occasions with obstacles raised by the occupying Power to the accomplishment of its mission. That is behaviour on the part of Israel which the Council cannot accept, especially now when the Lebanese Government is making every effort to move towards national reconciliation. Lebanon has already been far too much a theatre of many acts of violence which have caused numerous casualties. We must help Lebanon to regain its sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity. France, for its part, will always work along those lines.

90. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French)*: I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

91. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In his statement today, the representative of the United Arab Emirates has seen fit to invoke the Israel-Lebanon General Armistice Agreement of 1949,[2] defunct since 1967. As has been stated by the Government of Israel on numerous occasions—see for instance my statements in the Council of 12 June 1979 [*see 2147th meeting*] and 6 June 1982 [*see 2375th meeting*], as well as my letters addressed to the Secretary-General dated 27 May 1982 [*S/15132*], and 26 June 1984 [*S/16645*]—that Agreement was terminated in June 1967 as a result of Lebanon's participation in the June 1967 Arab-Israel hostilities.

92. Moreover, subsequent to June 1967, the Government of Lebanon also repeatedly demonstrated that it no longer considered the General Armistice Agreement in force by concluding a series of agreements with the terrorist PLO, starting with the Cairo Agreement of November 1969. Those agreements, by enabling the PLO terrorists to commit acts of murder and violence against Israel and its civilian population from within Lebanese territory, were totally incompatible with its basic obligations under the General Armistice Agreement. May I remind the Council of the provisions of article III, paragraph 3 of that Agreement, which provided that: "No warlike act or act of hostilities shall be conducted from territory controlled by one of the Parties to this Agreement against the other Party."

93. The conduct of the Government of Lebanon in 1967—and since—constituted a material breach of the Israel-Lebanon General Armistice Agreement of 1949 and thus brought about its termination. It is therefore not possible for anyone now to try to exhume and resuscitate an Agreement which Lebanon itself through its declarations and actions terminated many years ago.

94. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I now call on the representative of Lebanon, who has asked to speak.

95. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: There is no doubt that the members of the Council must have noticed that the Lebanese delegation thus far has avoided dealing with the subject of the Agreement of 17 May 1983. However, the representative of Israel insists on talking about that Agreement whenever he speaks, particularly about the breach of that Agreement by Lebanon. That Agreement was never in force under the Lebanese constitutional provisions, which require the signature of the Lebanese President on any bill submitted to him by the Lebanese Parliament. That Agreement was never in force under the international rules which concern an exchange of instruments.

96. Therefore, alleging that Lebanon has breached this Agreement is contrary to fact. The fact, as just stated by the representative of Israel, and repeated by him quite often, is that Israel considers the 1949 Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement[2] between Lebanon and Israel null and void. It is Israel that has violated that Agreement—one which had been in force for many years and is registered with the United Nations. It is an agreement which Lebanon considers to be still in force, notwithstanding the Israeli representative's claims to the contrary.

97. Lebanon alone has the right to speak on behalf of Lebanon. That Agreement is still valid; we still recognize it and call for its respect. The United Nations itself has recognized this Agreement up until the present time.

98. The PRESIDENT *(interpretation from French):* I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak.

99. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Israel-Lebanon Agreement of 17 May 1983 was signed by the Government of Lebanon and ratified subsequently, virtually unanimously, by the Lebanese Parliament. The Government of Lebanon went back on its signature and on the ratification of the Lebanese Parliament. Lebanon was not permitted to implement the provisions of that Agreement, and we all know the reason: it was heavy outside pressure, primarily pressure by the Syrian subjugators of Lebanon.

100. With regard to the General Armistice Agreement of 1949, obviously I do not pretend to speak for Lebanon, but I do have to point out that it was Lebanon that violated the Armistice Agreement in 1967 in a material and fundamental manner; and also its subsequent conduct constituted a material breach of that Agreement, thus bringing about its termination.

101. It is not in the power of the representative of Lebanon to try and revive and resuscitate an Agreement which was killed by Lebanon itself.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. 42, No. 655.
[3] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—February 1992—2,050